

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-81 and 88-97 are cancelled, leaving claims 82-87 pending in the application.

The pending claims stand rejected over Paek in view of Nakamura. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of such rejections.

Referring to claim 82, from which the remaining claims 83-87 depend, such recites a method in which a metal-enriched first metal silicide is formed over a substrate, a metal-containing layer is formed against the first metal silicide layer, and a silicon-containing layer is formed directly against the metal-containing layer and on an opposing side of the metal-containing layer from the first metal silicide layer. The claim further recites that metal of the metal-containing layer is converted to metal silicide to convert the metal-containing layer to a second metal silicide layer, and that such conversion incorporates silicon from the silicon-containing layer into the second metal silicide layer.

Claim 82 is allowable over the cited references for least the reason that the references do not suggest or disclose the recited formation of a metal-containing layer over a metal-enriched metal silicide, and subsequent conversion of the metal-containing layer to metal silicide. Further, the references do not disclose or suggest such aspect of claim 82 in combination with other recited features of claim 82, such as, for example, the recitation that the conversion of the metal-containing layer to metal silicide incorporates silicon from a silicon-containing layer that had been formed on an opposing side of the metal-containing layer from the metal-enriched metal silicide.


Claim 82 is allowable for the above-discussed reasons, and applicant therefore requests formal allowance of claim 82 in the Examiner's next action. Claims 83-87 depend from claim 82, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons discussed above regarding claim 82. Applicant therefore requests formal allowance of claims 83-87 in the Examiner's next action.

The Examiner indicates in the "Office Action Summary" that the Office Action of June 30, 2005 is non-final, but indicates in the Conclusion on page 6 of the same Office Action that it is a FINAL Action. It appears that the indication in the Conclusion of this being a Final Action is in error, and that the Action is in fact a non-final Action. Applicant is therefore filing this Response as a response to a non-final Action.

Claims 82-87 are allowable for the reasons discussed above, and applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner's next action be a Notice of Allowance formally allowing claims 82-87.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: AUGUST 3, 2005

By:   
David G. Latwesen, Ph.D.  
Reg. No. 38,533